

have no opportunities to unionize. As a result, they are turning to the authoritarian countries that can suppress labor rights and guarantee high profits for American companies.

China, for instance, is much more attractive to an American investigator than is India; China, a country which has a docile hierarchal workforce where workers cannot join unions, where workers cannot talk back, where workers often cannot switch jobs and go to a competing factory.

United States pretends to promote democratic ideals worldwide through foreign aid and through the rhetoric in this chamber. But as developing countries make progress towards democracy, the American business community rewards them by pulling its trade and investment and depositing their investments in money in other totalitarian countries.

Understand, where corporate CEOs walk the halls of Congress asking Members of Congress to support permanent trade advantages for China, understand where they say that we need to engage with China so China improves its human rights record, where China will quit persecuting Christians and China will quit allowing forced abortions in their country, understand that the three major economic players in China are the Communist party of China, the People's Liberation Army of China, which runs many of the factories there, and Western investors.

Those Western investors, the Communist party, the People's Liberation Army, none of them want to change the rules. The rules work just fine for them. They like an authoritarian government structure that does not reward an ability to organize and bargain collectively, that does not tolerate any kind of dissent, that does not allow for any kind of worker rights.

That is why American investment is more and more likely to go to China instead of India, instead of Taiwan, instead of South Korea, instead of a country that really is a democracy. That is why China's permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges are such a bad idea.

Shame on this country, shame on this Congress if we give permanent Most Favored Nations status trading privileges to a country that violates every human rights standard, every value that we in this country hold dear.

SUPPORT \$500 TAX CREDIT FOR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN ON FOOD STAMPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, for several weeks, I have been coming down to the floor talking about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps. Quite frankly, it has been a couple of weeks.

I brought tonight, as I have each and every night, the Marine who is getting ready to deploy for Bosnia. On his feet is his little girl named Magan. In his arms, he has a baby named Bridgette.

It so happens, on April 14, as my colleagues know, the Congress had closed for Easter. I was asked, along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), to attend a memorial service at New River Marine Air Station, as four Marines were among 19 Marines that were killed in the V-22 helicopter accident in Arizona a few weeks ago.

Sitting in the sanctuary during the memorial, I started thinking, I was looking around at Marines in attendance and just how many times those of us in this Nation take for granted the men and women in uniform that are willing to be called upon at any time to go defend this country and to give their life for this Nation.

So I am back on the floor tonight because I have introduced H.R. 1055, which is a bill that would give each and every member in the military that qualifies for food stamps, it would give them a \$500 tax credit. Quite frankly, it is not enough. At least it shows that we care, and it is a start.

I am pleased to tell my colleagues tonight, Madam Speaker, that we have 95 Members, both Democrats and Republicans, that are on this bill almost equally divided. Many on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side are in the leadership, and I am pleased they would join me in this effort to say to those who qualify for food stamps in uniform that we do care about them, we are trying to do something about it.

I have figures that are really kind of interesting, that the Defense Department says we have 6,500 men and women in uniform on food stamps, and the GAO says we have 13,000. Well, my point is, Madam Speaker, that one is one too many.

I think about the fact that we have already spent probably \$9 billion or \$10 billion in Bosnia, we have spent probably \$11 billion in Yugoslavia, and yet we cannot find the money to take our men and women in uniform off food stamps. That is unacceptable.

I speak about this quite frequently in my district. I see a lot of people in civic clubs and sometimes at churches, like any Member here that serves the United States House of Representatives. People come up to me afterwards and say, "I cannot believe that. I did not know that."

So I am hoping, by coming to the floor once a week, that I can encourage the leadership both, again, Republican and Democrat, to move this bill. There are other ideas that Members have, and they are good ideas. But I tell my colleagues that we have researched this thing for months going back a year ago, and what we found out, that if one really wants to make sure that those who qualify for food stamps are the ones that receive the assistance and no one drops through the cracks, then it

has to be this bill that we have introduced that would give a \$500 tax credit.

If there should be some movement on this bill, I hope, quite frankly, that, in a bipartisan way, we would raise that figure from \$500 to \$1,000.

So, Madam Speaker, I am going to close now. But, again, I want to remind the Members of the House that not only this Marine, this Marine represents everybody that is in uniform. We are sending our troops around this Nation just like a police force. I think between 1991 and 1999, they have been on 149 operations or deployments. I think about 60 percent of those in uniform are married.

So, again, I hope that we, in a bipartisan way, before we leave in October, will pass legislation that those that are on food stamps will know that we care about them. Because I know truthfully, Madam Speaker, that the American people are just outraged that anyone in uniform is on food stamps.

THIRTEEN JEWS HELD IN SHIRAZ, IRAN ON CHARGES OF ESPIONAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to address this House on the issue of the 13 Jews being held in the city of Shiraz in Iran and on trial on charges of espionage. Let me first provide a bit of background. The Jewish community of Iran has been there since the Babylonian captivity over 2,500 years ago. It is the oldest Jewish community anywhere in the world except for Israel itself. For 2,500 years, Jews have lived in peace and in loyalty to whichever regime has governed Persia, now Iran.

2000

In 1979, the Iranian revolution created the Islamic Republic. Since then, that Islamic Republic has found it necessary or appropriate for some reason to oppress its religious minorities. Its treatment of those of the Bahai faith is known to many of us and is deplorable. And as to those who practice the Jewish faith, some 17 have been killed in the last 21 years, roughly one a year, always after some sort of show trial, always absurd charges followed by execution.

In February of 1979, the government of Iran, perhaps dissatisfied with the idea of only one trumped-up execution a year of the Jewish community, instead decided to arrest some 13 Jews on absurd charges. They were charged with spying for the United States and spying for Israel.

Now, why can I brand these charges so absurd? Well, Madam Speaker, here in the United States we live in a multi-ethnic, multicultural society. People of all races, religions, and ethnicities are found in the National Security Administration, the CIA, the FBI, and other positions of importance to our national security. And so no matter what a person's ethnic background, every boy and

girl in America could find themselves in a position where they could be tempted to become a spy. And in fact we have Anglo American spies in our history and Chinese American spies. Perhaps there have even been Jewish American spies.

But Iran is a very different country. No one of the Jewish faith is allowed anywhere near anything of national security significance in Iran. And so to think that the CIA would reach out to this one small community and from there hire its spies is absolutely absurd. We could not be the world's only superpower if we hired as our spies those very few individuals in Iran absolutely precluded from getting the information that a spy might want.

These charges are not only absurd, but at the beginning of this month the trials began. The trials are modeled after those of Joseph Stalin; show trials in which there is no evidence except confession, and the confessions so devoid of information that they are evidence not of guilt but of the fear of the defendant. No information is given as to what the espionage sought to discover, what information was passed, to whom it was passed, or how it was passed. No information at all comes out in this trial except the fear of the defendants. Their confessions are evidence perhaps of torture, but not of guilt. Not since the days of Joseph Stalin have we seen such trials.

The question is what will the world do about it? The key is to have not only the American representative at the World Bank but the representatives of Germany and Japan stand up and say human rights does matter and to vote to delay any World Bank loan to this Islamic regime, the Islamic Republic of Iran. Until these 13 innocents are released, the World Bank should not hide behind professions that somehow its loans are only being used for a particular purpose, because loans are money that is fungible and that money will go to construction companies in Iran selected by and authorized by the Iranian government.

We must stand up for human rights. The World Bank is where this trial will be on trial.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I want to talk tonight about prescription drugs and, most importantly, about prescription drug prices.

We have had some discussion. The good news is, I think here in Washington, that there is a growing bipartisan feeling that we need to do something particularly for senior citizens about prescription drugs this year. The bad news is, it appears to me that we are going to continue just to throw good money after bad.

I have a chart here that describes, I think, what is a big part of the problem we have with prescription drugs. These are some comparison prices for one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. It is a drug called Prilosec. They are currently running a pretty aggressive advertising campaign. It is the purple pill. If someone buys those purple pills in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and again these are not my numbers, these are from an HMO in my State called Health Partners, but they did some research and found if an individual buys a 30-day supply of Prilosec in Minneapolis, Minnesota, they pay \$99.95. But if someone happens to be vacationing in Winnipeg, Manitoba, and they take the same prescription into a pharmaceutical drugstore, they will pay \$50.88. And, if someone happened to be vacationing in Guadalajara, Mexico, for exactly the same drug, made in exactly the same plant, under the exact same FDA approval, they would pay only \$17.50.

As a matter of fact, Health Partners claims that if they could recover just half of the savings between the United States and Canada, they could save their subscribers \$30 million a year.

When we start applying numbers like that to how much the Federal Government spends on prescription drugs every year, last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office we, the Federal Government, spent over \$15 billion on prescription drugs. Now, if we are paying 40 percent more than the folks on the north side and the south side of our borders, just imagine how much the Federal Government could save through Medicare and Medicaid, the VA, and other benefits.

Let me just run through some of the differences between what we pay in the United States for commonly prescribed brand name drugs and what they pay in Europe for exactly the same drugs. Premarin, \$14.98 here, they pay \$4.25 in Europe; Synthroid, \$13.84 versus \$2.95; Coumadin, and this is a drug my dad takes, and a lot of senior citizens take this, it is a blood thinner, we pay, the average price is \$30.25, they pay \$2.85; Prozac, \$36.12, \$18.50 over in Europe. Here we get a pretty good price, in Minneapolis. They say the average price for Prilosec, for a 30-day supply, is \$109, in Europe it is \$39.25.

Madam Speaker, the answer to our prescription drug problem in some respects does not require a whole new Federal agency. A big part of the problem, and I would like to share with Members and anyone who would like a copy, we can get a copy of a newsletter that was done by the Life Extension Foundation. It is available by calling my office at the Capitol or just sending an e-mail. We are easy to get ahold of. But this is an interesting little brochure and it talks about the differentiation and it really gets down to what the real problem is.

The real problem is our own FDA. Our own Food and Drug Administration is keeping American citizens from

bringing prescription drugs across the border. I think the best comparison that I can give, let us say, for example, that there are three drugstores, one downtown, one on the north side of town and one on the south side of town, but our own FDA says you can only shop at the one downtown. Even though they are charging, according to the Federal Government in the United States, the drug companies are charging 56 percent more than the prices in Canada, but our own FDA says we cannot shop at a store in Canada.

Now, the reason this is important is because we have what is called the North American Free Trade Agreement. That means the goods and services are supposed to go across the border freely. And just about all goods and services do, except prescription drugs. Madam Speaker, we need to make it easier for seniors and all Americans to get the prescriptions that they need and we need to get competitive prices. One way we can do that is open up our borders.

The FDA has overstepped its actual authority. In fact, if Members would like a copy, this is the actual language, which basically says it is the FDA's responsibility to prove that the drugs that are being brought into the United States are not safe. Unfortunately, the way they have interpreted this law is they have said, no, it is the responsibility of the consumer. We want to put that responsibility back on the FDA, where it belongs.

We should not allow our own FDA to stand between our consumers and lower drug prices.

WORKING FOR RESUMPTION OF INDIA-PAKISTAN DIALOGUE ON KASHMIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, recently we have seen some reason for hope about the resumption of a dialogue between Pakistan and India on resolving the Kashmir conflict. But we have also received a reminder of how difficult the path toward dying dialogue can be.

On the hopeful side, the United States has asked Pakistan to take concrete steps for the resumption of a productive dialogue with India and a return to what is known as the "Spirit of Lahore" so that there will be no more Kargils.

I should explain, Madam Speaker, that Lahore is a city in Pakistan near the border with India. It was the scene not much more than a year ago of a very amicable meeting between India's Prime Minister Vajpayee and the former Pakistani Prime Minister Sharif. Given the longstanding animosity between the two South Asian neighbors, the image of the two prime ministers embracing and pledging to